

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended to clarify the field to which the present invention relates, and claims 6-9 are cancelled as either having had their subject matter more precisely expressed in claim 1 or as having their subject matter expressed in new claims 13-20. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of that clarifying amendment and the following remarks.

Rejections Based On Lundgren

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lundgren, WO 00/20749. Claims 3, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious in view of Lundgren. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.¹

Lundgren relates to the manufacture of an outlet nozzle for a rocket engine. According to that reference, the nozzle has a sandwich-type construction with a plurality of longitudinally extending cooling channels extending from the inlet end of the nozzle to the outlet end of the nozzle.² The nozzle is fabricated by forming an inner wall 2 with a number of upstanding ribs or spacing elements 4 (e.g., by milling grooves into the outer surface of the inner wall 2); placing an outer wall 3 in surrounding or enveloping relationship with the inner wall 2, with the inner surface of the outer wall 3 contacting the ends of the spacing elements; then laser welding the outer wall 3 to the ends of the spacing elements 4.

In contrast, as previously recited in the preamble of claim 1, the present invention relates to a method for manufacturing a stator or rotor component. That focus of the present invention has been clarified by amending claim 1 to refer in the body of the claim – consistent with the preamble – to the wall element of the stator or rotor component and the ring element of the stator or rotor component. Moreover, the wall element has been expressly recited as constituting an

¹ To the extent claims 7-9 have been cancelled, the rejections are moot.

² Fuel passes through the cooling channels before being introduced into the combustion chamber, thereby cooling the nozzle.

airfoil-shaped, blade-type element. Applicant respectfully submits that the Lundgren reference neither discloses nor suggests the claim-recited method of making a stator or rotor component, such that it does not anticipate or render obvious the various rejected claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Similarly, new independent claim 13 (and therefore its dependent claims, too) specifically relates to a method for manufacturing a stator component. As is the case with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the Lundgren reference neither discloses nor suggests the claim-recited method of making a stator component, such that it does not anticipate or render obvious the newly presented claims.

Rejections Based on Dimberg and Harvard

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious based on Dimberg, U.S. 1,641,745, in view of Havard et al., US. 5,483,034. The Examiner cites Dimberg for its disclosure of a turbine disc assembly in which the tips of the blades are interconnected by means of a ring member (that is brazed onto the tips of the blades) and Havard for its disclosure of laser-welding metal parts together. According to the Examiner, “it would have been obvious . . . to have provided the invention of Dimberg with laser-welding the wall to the ring element from an opposite side of the ring element, in light of the teachings of Havard et al., in order to provide a faster and more efficient welding technique and in order to provide a more secure weld.” Furthermore, claims 3-6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious based on Dimberg in view of Havard as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Doran, U.S. 2,347,034, which the Examiner cites for its disclosure of multiple ring elements that are joined together to form a complete ring. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.³

Dimberg does disclose a gas turbine structure. Havard, in contrast, is directed to fixing stiffening structures inside a closed hollow box (strut) from the outside of the box. In Harard, grooves are formed in an interior surface of one of the walls defining the strut. The partitions are

positioned in the grooves so that they extend towards the opposite wall in the strut. Thereafter, the edges of the partitions distant from the grooves are fixed to the opposite wall by laser-welding by means of two inclined welds from an outside of the strut. Applicant submits that this manufacturing method is based on the fact that the partition has a relatively short length between the two walls and would possibly not be suitable for use in fastening a strut wall to the outer or inner ring, since it will be subjected to higher thermal and structural loads during operation. Due to the different operating conditions, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to combine Dimberg and Harvard. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, and timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

³ To the extent claims 6-9 have been cancelled, the rejections are moot.

Serial No.: 10/708,391
Confirmation No.: 2390
Applicant: LUNDGREN, Jan
Atty. Ref.: 7589.156.PCUS00

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, Order No. 7589.156.PCUS00.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, Examiner should directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tracy Druce".

Tracy Druce
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 35,493
Tel. 713.571.3400